(3)

The TEXTS examined which *Papists* cite out of the *Bible*, TO PROVE *The Supremacy of St.* PETER *and of the* POPE *over the whole Church.*

IMPRIMATUR.

Febr. 14. 1687. *Guil. Needham.*

THE Question to be debated in this Paper is, *Whether the Apostle St.* Peter *was constituted by Christ himself, to be, in his stead, the Head and supreme Governour of the whole Church.* This *we* deny, having undeniable Proofs that all the Apostles were placed by Christ, in equal Power and Authority over his Church. But the Doctors of the *Roman* Church affirm this with so much Confidence, as to say; that to deny it, is *not a simple Error, but a pernicious Heresy.* They are the words of *Bellarmine* *; who earnestly contends that *the Government of the whole Church was committed to* Peter, *especially about Matters of Faith.*

* L. 1. de Rom. Pontif. c. 10, 11.

Which bold Assertion he labours to support *three* ways.

182,3-35

Firſt, By ſome places of Holy Scriptures.
Secondly, By many Privileges and Prerogatives of St. *Peter*.
Thirdly, By Teſtimonies of Greek and Latin Fathers.

I am concerned only in the *firſt* of theſe Ways; in which if this Cauſe find no true ſupport, we need not trouble our ſelves about the other *two:* which are ſo weak, that ſome ingenuous Perſons in their Communion have acknowledged, the *Prerogatives* are either feigned at pleaſure, or no more to the purpoſe of his Supremacy, than the pretended *Teſtimonies* of Ancient Fathers, which are againſt it.

Now the *Scriptures* which they alledg for the proof of it, are *two* places in the holy Goſpels. The one in St. *Matthew* xvi. 18, 19. the other in St. *John* xxi. 17. In the former of theſe this Supreme Authority, they ſay, is *promiſed* to St. *Peter*; in the latter it is *conferred*.

I begin with the firſt, *Matth.* xvi. 18, 19. *And I ſay unto thee, that thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church*, &c. *And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven: and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* The Senſe of which words, ſays *Bellarmine*, is *plain and obvious: giving us to underſtand, the Soveraignty over the whole Church to be here promiſed unto* Peter, *in two Metaphors.* The one is a Metaphor of a *Foundation and a Building:* the other is a Metaphor of *Keys.* "For "what a Foundation is in the Building, that the Head "is in the Body, the Governour in the City, the King "in his Kingdom, and the Father of the Family in the "Houſe:

" Houſe: and to whom the Keys of a City are deli-
" vered, he is appointed the King, or at leaſt the Gover-
" nour of that City; to admit and ſhut out whom he
" pleaſeth.

Unto which I have this to ſay, before I give the true Senſe of theſe words: That to call this a *plain and obvious* Senſe of the words, which is wrapt up in a couple of *Metaphors*, is to ſtumble at the very Threſhold; and to contradict himſelf in the terms, as they ordinarily ſpeak. For what is *metaphorical*, is not *plain and obvious*; but needs Explanation, by putting it into common words: Into which if theſe *Metaphors* be reduced, we ſhall find there is no ſuch Senſe contained in them, as is pretended.

I ſhall explain them diſtinctly, and begin with the former part of this Promiſe, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church:* which we may call the firſt Proof they bring of St. *Peter*'s being the *Monarch of the Church.*

I. Which Senſe is ſo far from being *plain and obvious*, that having conſidered both the words, and all the ancient Expoſitors upon them, I can find nothing plainer than theſe *two* things: *Firſt*, That there is no certainty St. *Peter* is here meant by the *Rock*, upon which Chriſt ſaith he will build his Church: Nor, *Secondly*, If he were, that Chriſt intended by calling him a *Rock*, to make him the *Lord* of his Church.

Firſt, I ſay there is no Evidence that St. *Peter* is here meant by the *Rock:* but quite contrary, we are led by the general ſtream of Ancient Interpreters, to underſtand by the *Rock* upon which the Church is built, that *Faith* concerning Chriſt which *Peter* had newly

confeſſed. There are more than *two* that thus expound the words, for *one* that expounds them otherwiſe: as may be ſeen in a Sermon lately printed on this Subject *; which ſhows alſo that the other Expoſitions do not really differ from this; but even they, who apply theſe words to St. *Peter*, had reſpect (in calling him the *Rock*) to his preaching the Doctrine of Chriſt; and having the honour to be the firſt Preacher of it to the Gentiles. Which is all the Privilegd that can be thought to be peculiarly intended to him in theſe words. For, excepting this, whatſoever was ſaid to him, was directed to all the Apoſtles; becauſe *Peter* as their Mouth, ſpake the Senſe of them all, when he ſaid, *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God*; and therefore Chriſt's Anſwer was returned to them all, when he ſaid, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church.*

* *Sermon on St. Peter's day.* 1686.

As much as to ſay, *Thou art what thy Name imports, which I have given thee with reſpect to this ſolid Faith thou haſt now confeſſed: upon which, as upon a Rock, I will build my Church by your Miniſtry; and particularly by thine, who ſhalt have the Honour to lay the firſt Stone of it, in the Gentile World.* Thus St. *Auſtin* † expounds the words in many places; where he obſerves *Peter* had his Name from *Petra* the Rock, *viz. That Faith which he confeſſed*, upon which Chriſt told him he would build his Church. For he doth not ſay, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon thee will I build my Church*; but *upon this Rock*: which plainly relates to another thing, *viz.* that immoveable Foundation, confeſſed by *Peter*, that he was *Chriſt the Son of God.* Whence thoſe known words of the ſame Father, *I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee.*

† Tract. cxxiv. in Joh. Serm. xiii. *de verbis Dom*, &c.

If it were the intention of this Paper to quote Teſtimonies, I could name a great multitude, even the

ordi-

ordinary Gloſs, which ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe. But it is wholly needleſs, ſince the other Expoſition which makes St. *Peter* the Rock here ſpoken of, is againſt the moſt unanimous conſent of the Fathers of the Church: which they of the Church of *Rome* are bound to follow both by the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent* *, and by the form of that *Oath of Profeſſion of Faith* which Pope *Pius* IV. drew up and enjoined, according to the Mind of that Council. And yet (ſo vilely are ſome addicted to regard nothing but their Intereſt) there are thoſe, who, to make theſe words ſound as if Chriſt promiſed to build his Church upon *Peter* himſelf, have not bluſh'd thus to tranſlate them; *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this* PETER *will I build my Church.* So Dr. *Allen* would have had the Tranſlation run in the *Rhemiſh Teſtament:* and ſo *Hart* alledges them in his Conference with Dr. *Reynolds* †. And now lately the *Catholick Scripturiſt* tranſlates them after this manner, (according to the Language which Chriſt ſpoke) *Thou art a Rock, and upon this Rock will I build my Church.* As if it will be lawful for them to do any thing (even contradict that very Council, whoſe Decrees they are ſworn to obſerve) that they may make the Scripture ſeem to be on their ſide. For the Council of *Trent* hath decreed the old Latin Tranſlation *to be authentical*, with a prohibition that *no Man dare or preſume under any pretence to reject it.* Notwithſtanding which here are Men that preſume to reform it, and to make a new Tranſlation of their own Heads, as different from that *authentick* vulgar Tranſlation as from ours: for in this ours and that are the ſame, as every body may know that underſtands the *Latin* Tongue.

* Seſſ. iv.

† Chap. 2. Diviſ. 1.

This is a *Preſumption* with a Witneſs, to make their own Tranſlation depart ſo far from the Language which

which Chriſt ſpoke, as to put *tu es Petrus*, inſtead of *tu es Petra*: For ſo Chriſt's words ſhould have been tranſlated, if they ſignified *thou art a Rock*, unleſs they can ſhew us that *Petrus*, in any Author, is latin for *a Rock*. Till this be done, we muſt ſay that ſuch Men, contrary to their Faith ſolemnly ſworn, depart not only from Antiquity, but from themſelves.

And when they have done all they can, it will evidently appear, that the Church was not built by his Hands alone, (tho he began, as I ſaid, and laid the firſt Stone among the Gentiles) but by them all, and more eſpecially by St. *Paul*, who was called late into this Office, but *laboured more abundantly than they all*; and as *a wiſe Maſter-builder laid the Foundation*, upon which others built. Which Foundation, he tells us is *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf: who, he likewiſe ſays, is the *only Foundation*, and that no Man can lay *other Foundation* beſides him. Which ſhews this Promiſe, I am treating of, had reſpect to all that had the Office of Apoſtles; and wholly ruines the Authority of St. *Peter*, upon which they would have the Church to be built. For if *Jeſus Chriſt* be the only Foundation that can be laid, then *Peter* cannot be the Foundation: but only as a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, who help'd to lay the Foundation, which is Chriſt himſelf and his Faith. In which Miniſtry he was no more imployed than other Apoſtles; but St. *Paul*, who came laſt into this Miniſtry, was as *wiſe a Maſter-builder* as himſelf, and took more Pains than he or any of the reſt: laying the Foundation where neither St. *Peter*, nor any Body elſe had ever been, *leſt he ſhould build upon another Man's Foundation*, as he tells the *Roman* Church, *Rom.* xv. 20.

1 Cor. xv. 10. & iii. 10, 11.

Which words uttterly overthrow their vain diſtinction of a *firſt*, and a *ſecondary* Foundation, whereby they endea-

endeavour to elude thoſe words of St. *Paul* in the place before-named, 1 *Cor.* iii. 11. For it appears by this other place that St. *Paul* was a *ſecondary* or *miniſterial* Foundation, if we may ſo ſpeak; that is, ſpeak improperly, meaning thereby one that laid the Foundation. Which he did as much as St. *Peter*, or any other Apoſtle; nay, a great deal more, as he himſelf tells us, when he ſaith he laboured more abundantly than they all.

In exact ſpeaking, there is no Foundation on which the Church is built but *Chriſt alone* (as St. *Paul* aſſures us) *in whom all the Building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy Temple in the Lord*; Epheſ. ii. 21. But *Faith* in Chriſt, being that whereby we are joyned to him, it may be called by the ſame Name: and accordingly the *Coloſſians* are ſaid to be *grounded in the Faith*, as upon a *Foundation* (the Greek word ſignifies) from which he would have them not to be moved. And the *Apoſtles* (as he there ſaith) being the Preachers of this Faith, and the Inſtruments whereby Men were brought to believe on Chriſt, and ſo joyned to him as *Living Stones*, are called by the Name of *Foundation*, in the place before-named; *Epheſ.* ii. 20. *Built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*, &c. But then, it is evident that *Peter* alone is not this Foundation, but all the *Apoſtles*. For there are XII *Foundations* (of this ſort) as we read in *Rev.* xxi. 14. by whoſe Miniſtry the Church was built upon Chriſt; the *ſole Foundation* (in proper ſpeaking) that was laid for all to build upon.

** τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι. Col. 1. 23.

Finally, the Apoſtles underſtand no ſuch Preheminence, as is now pretended, to be promiſed to St. *Peter* in theſe words; nor did he himſelf ſo underſtand them, when the Holy Ghoſt was come upon them to lead

lead them into all Truth. For then St. *Paul* could not have ſaid, that he came *not a whit behind the very chiefeſt Apoſtles*, and that he was behind them *in nothing* (2 Cor. xi. 5. & xii. 11.) nor could he have undertaken to correct St. *Peter* (*Gal.* ii. 11, 12, &c.) nor would St. *Peter* have born his Cenſure, if he had known he was the Head of the Church: but have bidden St. *Paul* know his diſtance; and remember that he ought not to controul him, but be controuled by him as his Better.

Secondly; After all this that hath been ſaid, to ſhew there is nothing here promiſed to *Peter*, but what belongs to all the Apoſtles, except only that of his being imployed in laying the *firſt Foundation of Faith* among the Gentiles: It remains that I ſhew there is nothing in the word *Rock*, which implies any Superiority of Power and Authority over the reſt of his Brethren and the whole Church; if we ſhould ſuppoſe this Promiſe to have been made to him alone; for it denotes nothing of Government; but hath reſpect to the ſupport and ſtability of that Structure, which is firmly laid upon it. And therefore the ancient Doctors (as may be ſeen in the *Sermon* before-mentioned) give other Reaſons of his being called a *Rock*, and not this; *becauſe to him was committed the Government of the whole Church, eſpecially about Faith.* Which is the Explanation *Bellarmine* gives of this word, affirming it to be the ſignification of this Metaphor: *for it is proper to a fundamental Rock to govern and ſuſtain the whole Edifice.* This is perfectly new Language, never heard of in the World before, that *it is proper to a Foundation to govern*; for it is altogether *improper*, and no body thinks of any ſuch thing, when he reads of a *Foundation.* But if it be *proper*, then all the Apoſtles were Governours

vernours of the whole Church, as well as he; becauſe they were all *Foundations*, as was before obſerved; having the very ſame Power *given* to them by Chriſt, which, we now ſuppoſe, was here *promiſed* to him alone.

Unto which they of the Church of *Rome* have nothing to reply, but only this (which is meerly a bold Affirmation, and as abſurd as all the reſt) they were indeed *all of them the Heads, Governors, and Paſtors of the Church univerſal: but not after the ſame manner as* Peter *was of* *. Why ſo? *For they had the higheſt and moſt ample Power, as Apoſtles and Ambaſſadors; but* Peter *alſo as an ordinary Paſtor.* As much as to ſay, They had indeed the higheſt Power in the Church, and as large as he, but not ſo high a Power as his. Let any Man try, if he can make any other Senſe of thoſe words; that is, find any Senſe at all in them. For was this Power of being *an ordinary Paſtor*, greater than that of the *Apoſtles*, or no? If it were greater, then it is not true which he affirms, that *the Apoſtles had the higheſt Power* †. If it were leſs than the Power of the Apoſtles, then they were all greater than he, as he was *an ordinary Paſtor:* and then it is non-ſenſe to ſay, *they ſo had a plenitude of Power, as that St.* Peter *was notwithſtanding the Head of them, and they all depended on him.* For he rather depended on them, as an *ordinary Paſtor*, if that was leſs than the Power of the Apoſtleſhip: and if it were not, but greater than it; then (as I ſaid) it is falſe, that the Apoſtles had the higheſt Power.

* Bellarm. l. 1. de Pontif. Rom. cap. xi.

† Habuerunt ſummam Poteſtatem.

This is ſufficient to ſhew into what Abſurdities Men run, when they go about to maintain a Falſhood; and what wretched ſhifts they deviſe to obſcure the clear Truth, which ſhines in their Eyes: Which when they have done, they walk as in Darkneſs, and

cannot be perſwaded to ſee or acknowledg their Error. Nay, one Error grows out of another, and having begun to wreſt the Holy Scripture, they go on to ſtrain it, ſo far as to extend it to any purpoſe they have to ſerve by it.

For having preſumed that *Peter*, and he alone, is promiſed to be made the Governour of the whole Church, by theſe Words of our Saviour, they immediately preſume, without the ſhew of a proof, that the Biſhops of *Rome* ſucceed him in this Authority. Which is a very large Step, or rather Leap, from *Peter* to the *Popes of Rome*, between whom there is ſuch a vaſt diſtance, that it is impoſſible to make out the Claim, to which they pretend from him. For there is no evidence that St. *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, but only that he founded that Church, and ſetled a Biſhop there. For if he was Biſhop of *Antioch*, it was againſt all antient Rules, to leave that, and go to another See. The truth is, he was properly Biſhop of neither; but planted a Church in each: and firſt at *Antioch*, before he came to *Rome*. And who can think he did not ſettle one to take care of that Church of *Antioch*, when he left it? who may be called his *Succeſſor*, as well as he, whom he is ſuppoſed to have placed afterwards in *Rome*. Which *two* things being allowed, as unqueſtionable Matters of Fact, there is no reaſon can be given why all the Power and Juriſdiction which is claimed upon the account of *Succeſſion*, ſhould not devolve by the Right of Primogeniture, upon the Biſhop of *Antioch*: ſince it is confeſſed he firſt ſat there, and ſat there *ſeven* Years, which is more than can be proved he did at *Rome*, where he was not when St. *Paul* came thither (*Act.* xxviii.) nor when he firſt anſwered before *Nero*, nor when he was ready to be offered, 2 *Tim.* iv. 6, 11, 16. nor can any certain time

time he aſſigned when he was there, as we are ſure St. *Paul* was, who is acknowledged to be a Founder of that Church, and had as much (or rather more) right to leave a Biſhop to ſucceed him there, as St. *Peter*; who could transfer to no body, neither there nor any where elſe, what was perſonally veſted in him; as all the Priviledg here granted him was. Or, if he was to have any Succeſſor in his ſuppoſed Dominion, there were others had a better Title to it, than the Biſhop of *Rome*; particularly St. *John*, who it is certain ſurvived St. *Peter*. Therefore all that *Bellarmine* dare ſay in this matter is, *that the Apoſtles being dead, the Apoſtolical Authority remained in* Peter's *Succeſſor alone*. For which he gives us not one word of proof, but only this notorious Falſhood, that the Roman Biſhop alone is called by all, the *Apoſtolical Biſhop*, and his See ſimply the *Apoſtolical See*. When all the World knows, *Jeruſalem*, *Conſtantinople*, and divers other Places are called by the ſame Name of *Apoſtolical Sees*, or Churches; and their Biſhops called not only Apoſtolical, but *Catholick*, and ſaid to be *Biſhops of the Catholick Church*. The meaning of all which is nothing elſe, but that they held the Catholick Religion and Faith, as *Launoy* moſt ingenuouſly confeſſes, and maintains the Roman Biſhops themſelves intended no more, when they ſubſcribed themſelves *Biſhops of the Catholick Church*.

L. 1. de Pont. Rom. c. ix.

Epiſt. pars 1. ad Franciſcum Bonum.

Nay, *Bellarmine* himſelf, in the place now named, is conſtrained to acknowledg, *that the Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Power was given not only to* Peter, *but to other Apoſtles alſo*. For they might all ſay that of St. *Paul*, 2 Cor. xi. 28. *My daily buſineſs, the Care of all the Churches. But it was given to* Peter *as an ordinary Paſtor, who ſhould have perpetual Succeſſors: to others as Delegates, who ſhould have no Succeſſors.* Which is a meer Invention, a pure

Figment of his own brain; without the ſhadow of a ground for it in the Book of God, or any ancient Authority; and againſt his own Confeſſion, that all the Apoſtles had the higheſt Power; which includes all Power both *ordinary* and *extraordinary*, and a Power to appoint their Succeſſors, in the Places they converted.

There have abundance of other things been ſaid by our Writers, to ſhew that whatſoever may be ſuppoſed to have been promiſed in theſe Words, the Biſhops of *Rome* can thence derive no lawful Claim to the like Authority. And yet (as if there were nothing plainer, than that Chriſt ſpake to the Roman Biſhops, when he ſaid theſe Words to St. *Peter*) they have the confidence from hence to entitle the Pope to the Privileg of *Infallibility*, as well as to a *Supreme Dominion* over the Church. So *Bellarmine*, who elſewhere alledges theſe Words, to prove that *the chief Biſhop* (i. e. theirs) *when he teacheth the whole Church, in things belonging to Faith, can in no caſe err.* But this depends upon his former Suppoſitions, that *Peter* is the *Rock* of the Church as its Supreme Governour; and therefore every one of his Succeſſors in like manner is the ſame: which having no Foundation, all his Superſtructure upon them falls to the Ground. And indeed it is ſo ſandy, that honeſt Men among themſelves are aſhamed to build any thing of this nature upon it: Particularly *Launnoy* who, on ſet purpoſe, demonſtrates that *Bellarmine* neither obeyed the Decree of the *Trent* Council, nor kept the Profeſſion of Faith enjoined by *Pius* IV. when he drew this Concluſion of the Popes *Infallibility*, from theſe Words, *Thou art Peter*, &c. but was guilty of down-right Flattery of the Court of *Rome*; for whoſe ſake he, in like manner, falſified in the Citations he brings out of the Fathers, to maintain the ſame Untruth.

L. iv. de Rom. Pontific. c. 3.

Epiſt. pars v. Gulielmo Vocllo.

But

But further than this, the ſame Writer preſſes theſe words, to prove, that *General Councils cannot err, neither in believing, nor teaching* †. Which is as much as to confeſs that what Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*, was intended to all Biſhops: of whom a General Council conſiſts. But here he endeavours to bring off himſelf, by this *Salvo*; *if the Council be confirmed by the Pope*: as if they received their Infallibility from him; who turns their doubtful Opinions into Oracles. Whence it is, that from the very ſame words, [*Thou art Peter* &c.] he proves the Pope to be *above a Council* *; *immediately conſtituted by Chriſt the Paſtor and Head, not only of all particular Churches, but alſo of the whole univerſal Church congregated together.*

† L. 2. de Conc. Autor. cap. i.

* Ib. cap. xv.

If this be to interpret the Scripture, I know not what is ſetting it upon the Rack; and ſtretching it as far as it pleaſeth him who takes it in hand. No Hereticks ever took ſo great a liberty as this; which, according to their way of reaſoning, makes it neceſſary to ſeal up the Bible quite, that no body may look into it. For if the danger of wreſting the holy Scriptures, be a juſt cauſe for denying the liberty of reading them to illiterate people; it ought not to be granted to the moſt Learned, who (it appears by this great Cardinal) are in as much, or more danger of this than any other Men: and ſo farewel the ſtudy of the Scriptures, which neither Prieſt nor People muſt meddle withal.

But, thanks be to God, there is ſuch a thing as Honeſty and Integrity ſtill remaining in the World; which qualifies all Men for the wholſome peruſal of them: and hath preſerv'd the minds of ſome in that Communion ſo uncorrupted, as to make them diſdain and reject theſe perverſe and arrogant Interpretations, or Diſtortions rather, of Holy Scripture. There is one hath lately

lately declared his ſenſe of this Promiſe to St. *Peter*, in remarkable words; with which I conclude this part of my Diſcourſe †: *Suppoſing Chriſt to have ſpoken theſe words* [and upon this Rock] *of the Perſon of* Peter; *he meant nothing elſe thereby, but that* Peter *ſhould labour very much in the Edification of the Church; that is, in the Converſion of the Faithful, and Adminiſtration of the Churches. And therefore the moſt that can be deduced from hence is, that he ſhould be the firſt and the chief among thoſe who were to preach the Goſpel: but it cannot from hence be gathered, with* Bellarmine, *that the Government of the whole Church was committed to* Peter, *eſpecially about Faith.*

† Du Pin de antiquæ Eccleſ. Diſcipl. Diſſert. iv. cap. 1. ſect. 1.

II. The truth of this will further appear, in the Explication of the next Words, which expound thoſe of which I have now treated: *And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, it ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.*

The ſenſe of which is not ſo *plain and obvious*, as *Bellarmine* pretends; but we agree that they are a plain alluſion to the Words of the Prophet *Iſaiah* concerning *Eliakim*, Iſa. xxii. 23. *I will give thee the Keys of the Houſe of* David, *i. e.* make thee not *High-Prieſt*, as he groſsly miſtakes, but *Steward* of the Royal Family, to take in and thruſt out whom thou ſhalt think fit. Such was the Power here promiſed to *Peter* by our Lord, who ſaith of himſelf, that *he hath the Key of David* (Rev. iii. 7.) *i. e.* of the Houſe or Family of *David*; which he alone governs by an abſolute Power; but tells *Peter* he intended to make him, under himſelf, his Supreme Lord and Maſter, ſuch a Steward in the *Church*, as *Eliakim* had been in the *Court*.

I ſay, in the *Church*; for by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, I think no body now will diſpute, is meant the Family of Chriſt, or the *Chriſtian Church*, in a great many places of the Goſpel; and moſt likely is ſo to be interpreted here. But if any body be ſo minded as to underſtand by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, not the Chriſtian Society here below, but the Company of the Bleſſed above; let them conſider that the ſenſe will ſtill be the ſame; becauſe by admiſſion into the one, and abiding in it, we come to the other. And Baptiſm is the Key which lets us into the Church, out of which ſuch as notoriouſly break their Baptiſmal Vow, ought to be ſhut, by the Cenſures of the Church; and again received into it upon their hearty Repentance, by granting them Abſolution. Thus the following Words expound it, and *whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, &c.*

That *binding* and *looſing* are one and the ſame, with the *Power of the Keys*, is acknowledged by the *Roman Catechiſm* * and by *Bellarmine* himſelf, who confeſſes the *plain ſenſe* of theſe Words to be, that *firſt of all an Authority or Power is promiſed, defined by Keys; and then the Actions or Office of this Power is explained by thoſe words, looſing and binding. So that to looſe and to open, to ſhut and to bind, is altogether the ſame thing* †. And we need not further trouble our ſelves to inquire how far this Power extends: for it is certain there is nothing here promiſed, though we ſuppoſe it never ſo large, which was intended to him alone, but to them all; except that of opening the door firſt to let the Gentiles into the Church.

* De Sacrament. Pœnitenn. 44.

† L. 1. de Pont. Rom. cap. xii. verùm.

This is apparent from what was ſaid before concerning Chriſt, ſpeaking to them all in him, as he ſpake for them all, in anſwer to our Saviour's Queſtion propounded to the whole Company. Which produced this

this Promiſe from our Saviour, not to him alone, but to all them in whoſe Name he ſpake. Which is no new Interpretation, but as old as the Church it ſelf: for *the Antients ſay with an unanimous conſent, that theſe Keys were given to the whole Church in the Perſon of* Peter *; as a late Writer in the *Roman* Communion honeſtly confeſſes. St. *Auſtin* particularly, *inculcates this an hundred times* (as his words are) a proof of which may be ſeen in another of his Brethren †, who hath made a Collection of xxvi places out of his Works, to ſhew that he taught this *openly, frequently and conſtantly*, in ſuch plain words as may be underſtood by themſelves, without the help of an Interpreter. I cannot well forbear to mention one of them, becauſe it affords us many conſiderable Remarks: ‖ *As ſome things* (ſays he) *are ſpoken, which may ſeem properly to belong to the Apoſtle* Peter, *and yet have not a clear Senſe, but when they are referred to the Church* (*whereof he is acknowledged to have repreſented the Perſon in a Figure, becauſe of the Primacy he had among the Apoſtles*) *as that is, I WILL GIVE THEE THE KETS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, and if there be any like: ſo* JUDAS *ſuſtains, after a certain manner, the Perſon of the Jews, the Enemies of Chriſt*, &c.

Here they of the Church of *Rome* are very forward to catch at theſe words, which ſignify *a place of Priority* that *Peter* had among the Apoſtles (which no body denies) but are not willing to take any notice of all the reſt; which utterly overthrow that *Primacy* which they would advance him unto from this place. For *firſt*, he ſays, ſome things do but *ſeem* to belong to *Peter*, which in truth ought to be referred to the Church. And *ſecondly*, That their Senſe is *not clear* or evident, till they be carried beyond *him*. Among which things, *thirdly*,

* Du Pin de antiqua Eccleſ. Diſc. diſſert. iv. c. 1. Sect. 1.

† Jo. Launoy Epiſt. par. 2. Hadriano Valantio, p. 14. *&c.*

‖ Aug. Enarratio in Pſal. cviii.

thirdly, he reckons what our Saviour here ſaith, *I will give thee the Keys*, &c. which they would now ingroſs to St. *Peter*, and have us believe *this* to be the *plain and obvious* ſenſe of Chriſt's words, which St. *Auſtin* ſays are not plain, unleſs we refer them to the Church. Whoſe Perſon (*fourthly*) he ſays he did bear or repreſent, not by virtue of his Place, or any Authority he had above the reſt, but *in a Figure*, to ſignify Unity, that is, as the Ancients interpret it. And it is farther remarkable, (*fifthly*) that Chriſt did not promiſe him the *Primacy*, in promiſing him *the Keys*, for he had the *Primacy* (here ſpoken of) before; and with reſpect to that Chriſt directed to him theſe words, rather than any of the reſt, becauſe he was already the *firſt*, not in *Office*, but in *Order*; and ſo the fitteſt Perſon to be ſingled out, to repreſent what Chriſt intended. And to convince every one there is no Authoritative Primacy meant in theſe words of St. *Auſtin*, he adds (*ſixthly*) that *Judas* ſuſtained the Perſon of Chriſt's Enemies, as *Peter* did of the Church. Will any body infer from hence, that *Judas* had a Juriſdiction over all the wicked, and left it to his Succeſſors, one of which hath now the ſame? Let them forbear then to make ſuch Inferences, from what is ſaid of St. *Peter*'s Primacy, which gave him no right to rule, but only made him ſtand faireſt, being the firſt, to be choſen to repreſent the reſt. If any will be ſtill ſo perverſe as to wrangle, becauſe St. *Auſtin* doth not mention *Judas* his *Primacy* as he doth of *Peter*'s; let them learn more Modeſty by knowing that *Proſper*, one of St. *Auſtin*'s Scholars, upon the very ſame *Pſalm*, ſays in expreſs terms, that * *Judas carried the Primacy of Chriſt's Enemies*. Which if they will not expound to ſignify a ſupreme Authority to govern Chriſt's Enemies, let them no longer interpret

* Judas primatum geſſit inimicorum Chriſti.

St. *Peter*'s Primacy to ſignify ſuch an Authority over his Friends. He had none here promiſed him, is as certain as any thing can be; but the Keys to commend Unity, were promiſed *him*; which were in truth given to *all* the reſt. This is the ancient Senſe, which drew this plain and pertinent Obſervation from another honeſt Writer, in the *Roman* Communion, * *He ſaid to Peter, I will give thee the Keys, but he did not ſay, I will give them to thee alone.*

* Rigaltius in Epiſt. Firmiliani.

Which is juſtified to be true, by *three* other Paſſages in the holy Goſpels. In the *firſt* of which, he promiſes as much to all in the very ſame words, as he had done to him. *Matth.* xviii. 18. *Verily I ſay unto you, Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven: and whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven:* which is the Explication, as you heard before, of *the Power of the Keys*, in the ſame terms, (without the leaſt difference but what is between the *plural* number and the *ſingular*) wherein it was delivered to St. *Peter*. And in the *next* Chapter he repeats it again, only in other words, when he ſaith *Matth.* xix. 28. *Ye ſhall ſit upon* XII *Thrones, judging* (*i. e.* ruling and governing) *the* XII *Tribes of* Iſrael; without any mention of *one Throne*, peculiar and higher than the reſt, to St. *Peter*. And thus far there is no more than a Promiſe to be met withal in the Goſpel, but no actual grant, no words whereby our Lord makes a conveyance of this Power to them, till after his Reſurrection from the Dead. When he gives out a Commiſſion to them, as large as can be made; wherein there is nothing peculiar reſerved to St. *Peter*, but it runs in general terms to them all, *John* xx. 21, 22, 23. For he neither ſaith, I ſend *thee*, nor breathed upon *him* alone, ſaying, Receive *Thou* the Holy Ghoſt: Whoſoever

ſoever Sins *thou* remitteſt, *&c.* But he ſaith to them, being all ſave *Thomas* aſſembled together, *As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you. And when he had ſaid thus, he breathed on them, and ſaid unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt: Whoſoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſoever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* And accordingly, it may be added, when the Holy Ghoſt deſcended (of which this *breathing on them* was an Emblem and Pledg) *they were all* (*Thomas* with the reſt) *with one accord in one place,* and it was imparted to each of them alike, without any mark of diſtinction. For we read of no Flame that crowned the Head of St. *Peter,* greater and more illuſtrious than that upon his Brethren: but the Text ſaith, the Tongues, like as of Fire, were divided, and ſat upon *every one of them ſingly* *, *and they were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt*; Acts ii. 2, 3. The mighty Wind alſo, wherein this Flame came (betokening the powerful Inſpiration which was entring into them) *filled all the Houſe where they were ſitting,* and not only that Corner where St. *Peter* was placed. And ſo this Promiſe was equally performed in common to them all, as it had been made to them all. Nay, this very thing is no leſs than a demonſtration, that the Promiſe was intended to all, becauſe the Performance was to all.

* ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν.

That here his Promiſe was performed, is very manifeſt to thoſe, who are deſirous to underſtand the Truth: for no other time can be named when it was performed to *Peter*; nor any other words found, wherein the thing promiſed was conveyed, but theſe, *as my Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you.* And *laſtly,* this is the ſenſe of the Church, as appears by St. *Cyprian* in ancient times; who obſerves that our Lord, who ſaid to *Peter, Thou art* Peter, *&c.* gave to all his Apoſtles *equal*

* Parem Poteſtatem.

Power * after his Reſurrection, when he ſaid, As *the living Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you*, &c. concluding from thence, that all the Apoſtles were what St. *Peter* was †: And by *Theophylact* in later times, who thus gloſſes upon *Matth.* xvi. 19. *Though our Lord ſaid only to* Peter, *I WILL GIVE THEE*, yet they were given to *all the Apoſtles. When? at that time when he ſaid, Whoſoever Sins ye remit they are remitted. For the word, I WILL GIVE, denotes the future time, that is, after the Reſurrection.*

† Hoc utiq; erant & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit Petrus, pari conſortio præditi & honoris & poteſtatis, &c. L. de unitate Eccleſiæ & Epiſt. xxiii. ad Jubianum.

Then he ſaid to them all, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you.* Which are words ſo large that they contain in them a *plenitude of Power*; and confute the conceit of thoſe who ſay that Chriſt indeed gave the *Power of remitting and retaining Sins* to all the Apoſtles, but the *Power of the Keys* to *Peter* alone. Whereby if they meant that to *Peter* it was given to open the Gate firſt to the Gentiles, it ought to be allowed to be a true ſenſe; tho we are not certain it was the thing peculiarly intended by our Saviour in theſe words. But underſtanding thereby a diſtinct Power from that of *binding and looſing, retaining and remitting*, (which St. *Peter* exerciſed when he let the Gentiles into the Church) it is certainly falſe that he gave him ſuch a Power, which he did not confer upon the reſt. For ſhould we ſuppoſe *binding and looſing* to be diſtinct from *the Power of the Keys*, yet this *Power of the Keys* (be it what it will) we may be ſure is included in theſe comprehenſive words, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you*; which were ſpoken unto them all.

And therefore as *the Keys* were not promiſed to him *alone*; ſo not to him *more* than any other Apoſtle; but only the uſe of them *firſt*, before any other Apoſtle. That's the moſt (as I have often ſaid) which can reaſonably

reaſonably be conceived to be peculiarly promiſed to *Peter* in theſe words, that he ſhould firſt open the Door of Faith to the *Gentiles*, as we read he did, *Acts* x. and as ſome think to the *Jews* alſo, *Acts* ii. *Tertullian* * ſeems to be of this mind (and I ſhall not here diſpute it) who mentioning this place, *I will give thee the Keys*, &c. thus proceeds; *ſo the Event teaches us; the Church was firſt built on him; that is, by him.* He firſt handled the Key. See what Key; *Ye Men of* Iſrael, *hear theſe words: Jeſus of* Nazareth *a Man approved of God among you*, &c. (Acts ii. 22, *&c.*) *He in fine did firſt by the Baptiſm of Chriſt, unlock the entrance of the Heavenly Kingdom*, &c. *He bound* Ananias *with the Bond of Death; and he abſolved the Man lame of his Feet, from the weakneſs wherewith he laboured. And in the Diſpute which aroſe about the Obligation of the Law*, Peter *firſt of all by the inſtinct of the Holy Ghoſt* (having told them how God made choice of him that the *Gentiles* ſhould hear the Word from his Mouth) *ſaid, And now why tempt ye God, to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Diſciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear*, &c. where he plainly makes the *Power of the Keys*, and *binding and looſing* to be the ſame thing: and from the ſcope of his Diſcourſe, it appears (as *Launoy* † hath obſerved) that they then believed at *Rome* that in the Perſon of *Peter the Keys* were given to the Church; that is, ſays he, *the power of binding and looſing.* Which things if the late *Catholick Scripturiſt* had known, or would have been pleaſed to mind, how could he have had the Confidence to ſay, that our Lord ſpake theſe words to *Peter* to ſignify, that *he was the Head and Chief in ordinary. For tho the Power of binding and looſing was afterward given to the other Apoſtles, yet the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are never in Scripture ſaid to be given*

* L. de Pudicitiæ c. xxi.

† Epiſt. par. ii. Hadriano Vallantio, p. 6.

* *The ſeventh Point*, n. 6.

given to any but to St. Peter *. By which *Keys* alſo he ſaith is ſignified, *the plenitude of higheſt Power:* For this vain Conceit is contrary to the common Opinion of the ancient Fathers (whom they are bound by their Profeſſion of Faith and Oath, to follow) contrary to their greateſt Schoolmen, (ſuch as *Scotus, Aquinas, Alex. Alenſis*) who affirm that the Keys promiſed to *Peter* in St. *Matth.* xvi. were given to all the Apoſtles in St. *John* xx. contrary alſo to their own *Catechiſm* (as I have ſhown) according to which he ought to have inſtructed his Followers.

The Sum of what hath been ſaid is this:

1. The Power which our Lord here promiſed to *Peter*, was not meant to him alone.

2. For he did but repreſent and ſuſtain the Perſon of the Church (as the Ancients ſpeak) to whom this Promiſe belongs.

3. And therefore our Lord afterward promiſes the very ſame thing, in the ſame words to all the Apoſtles, which he here promiſes to *Peter*.

4. And accordingly when he performed his Promiſe, he gave this Power to every one of them equally.

5. But Chriſt directed this Promiſe at the firſt ſingularly to him, that he might commend *Unity*.

6. Or, at the moſt, he promiſed him the Honour, of opening the Door of Faith firſt unto the Gentiles.

7. From whence we can only gather that he was the firſt among the Apoſtles; but not that he was promiſed any Power which the reſt had not: for the contrary is apparent.

8. To all which I muſt add (repeating briefly what I ſaid upon the foregoing words) that if we ſhould grant our Saviour to have promiſed ſome Power to

Peter

Peter (when he ſaid, *I will give thee the Keys*) which the other Apoſtles had not; it would prove a perſonal Prerogative, and cannot be ſhewn to have deſcended to any Succeſſor, much leſs to the Pope of *Rome*; who, *Bellarmine* ſaith, is a *true Prince*, who *hath Power to make true Laws to bind the whole Church.* And this he proves from theſe words, *Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven*, &c. *

* L. iv. de Rom. Pontif. c. xvi.

Concerning which it will be thought too ſharp perhaps to ſay (tho they are the words of one in the *Roman* Communion †) *ſimply to relate the words of this Author, is ſimply to confute them; they are ſo very contrary to Truth and Equity.* The Reader therefore may be pleaſed briefly to conſider, what our Lord himſelf ſaith to all his Apoſtles, *Matth.* xxiii. 8, 9, 10. which utterly overturns theſe proud Pretenſions. *But be not ye called* Rabbi, *for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt; and* ALL YE ARE BRETHREN. *And call no Man your Father upon the Earth; for one is your Father which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called Maſters, for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt.* The repetition of one and the ſame thing ſo often, in words of the ſame import, argues it to be a matter of great moment, which ought to be duly weighed. And it is this, that no Man, no not any of his Apoſtles, ſhould take upon him to preſcribe that as a part of Religion, which God our Saviour hath not preſcribed by his Laws: and that we ought not abſolutely to ſubmit to any Man's Dictates, as Children do to the Will of their Fathers; nor pin our Faith, as we ſpeak, upon any Man's ſleeve; *i. e.* let it depend intirely upon his Authority: For this is a ſubmiſſion which is due only to God our Saviour, (who in this Senſe of the words) is our only *Father*, and *Maſter*, and *Leader*; and therefore we cannot, without the higheſt injury to him,

† Launoy ubi ſupra, p. 77.

him, own any one elſe to be ſuch, nor give them theſe Names; but as they teach, not their own, but Chriſt's Doctrine unto Men. And in this Office all the Apoſtles were equal, and no one of them could claim an Authority over the reſt of his *Brethren.*

There are many other places wherein we read of *one Shepherd, one Lord, one Lawgiver, who is able to ſave and to deſtroy:* from whence we may conclude that *Peter* himſelf had no Power to *make*, but only to *declare* the Laws of his and our Lord and Lawgiver, Jeſus Chriſt. So the words of Chriſt's Commiſſion run, when he ſaith, not to him alone, but to them all, *Go ye, and diſciple all Nations*, &c. *teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you*, Matth. xxviii. 20. Here is their Authority, to publiſh the Commands of their Maſter, not what they pleaſed to command themſelves. Which *Peter* was ſo far from doing, that he went not about the *abrogation* of the Ceremonial Law, and the *calling of the Gentiles*, till he was authorized by an heavenly Viſion; which diſcovered this Myſtery to him, as a part of the Counſel of God, but no Law, nor ſo much as a Thought of his own. For being charged afterwards by the Jews for eating with Men uncircumciſed, he excuſes himſelf by a long Apology, wherein he relates how he was commanded to do it by God himſelf, whom he could not withſtand (*Acts* xi. 3, 4, &c.) which was not done like a Lawgiver. Nay, after this Revelation made to him, he was ſo weak as to obſerve this Law, to the great Offence of the Gentiles; for which he was reprehended by St. *Paul*, who had the honour to abrogate the Law of *Moſes* among the Gentiles while St. *Peter* (who began that work) was the Miniſter of the Circumciſion: *Gal.* ii. 7, 10, 11, *&c.*

Nor

Nor doth the word [*Bind*] import a Power to impoſe Laws, but only to tie Men to thoſe Laws which are already made. Thus it ſignifies in that very place, which *Bellarmine* alledges to maintain his Senſe of the word, *viz.* to make Laws: *Matth.* xxiii. 4. *For they bind heavy Burdens, and grievous to be born, and lay them on Men's Shoulders*, &c. that is, they were rigorous Interpreters of the Laws of God, which it was their Office to expound, according to the plain ſenſe and meaning of them, and not according to the Traditions of the Elders, which had made them intollerable Burdens.

But ſuppoſe the word to ſignify what they pleaſe, it will do them no ſervice; becauſe this Power of *Binding* was not promiſed to *Peter* alone, but to them all, as hath been before proved. And conſequently he could do nothing, which they could not do as much as he; that is, they were all *Miniſters of Chriſt, and Stewards of the Myſteries of God:* All of them like to *Eliakim*, to whom the *Key of the Houſe of David* is promiſed, as the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to *Peter*. For by that very word which we tranſlate *Stewards*, or *Diſpenſers*, is that Office * to which *Eliakim* was advanced in the room of *Shebna*, expreſſed by the LXX. in *Iſa.* xxii. 19, 21. which was not a *Supreme Power* in the Court, where all the reſt of the Courtiers did not depend on him as their Lord and Prince; but the Power of a prime *Miniſter* in the Royal Family, which he governed not after his own Will, but the King's. In like manner all the Apoſtles were *Miniſters*, by whom Men believed (1 *Cor.* iii. 5.) *Stewards* of the heavenly Myſteries, which they faithfully diſpenſed (1 *Cor.* iv. 1, 2.) according to the Will of Chriſt, who *hath the Key of David*; that is, is the ſole Supreme Governour of the

1 Cor. iv. 1.

* οἰκονομίαν.

Church, and gives Rules to it; which the Apoſtles delivered, but did not ordain themſelves, nor bind upon Men by their own Authority, but by his. For they were not Authors of the Divine Laws, which they taught, but the Publiſhers of them, and equal Publiſhers of one and the ſame common Doctrine: Which *every Biſhop* in the Church hath as much Authority to bind upon Men as the *Pope*: They being *all of the ſame Merit and Prieſthood* (as St. *Hierom** ſpeaks) *all Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.*

* Epiſt. ad Evagrium.

There are ſome other words of St. *Hierom* (it may not be unfit here to note) which are uſually alledged to prove the contrary, *viz.* That he thought St. *Peter* had ſome Supremacy of Power over the reſt of the Apoſtolical Colledg; from whence they hope to derive the like Power unto the *Pope* over all Biſhops: They are in his *firſt* Book againſt *Jovinian*, where he ſaith, *One among the twelve was therefore choſen, that an* HEAD *being conſtituted, the occaſion of Schiſm might be removed.* But they are unconſcionably diſingenuous who alledg this Paſſage, and do not give us the entire Sentence, but only this Concluſion of it; which can have no ſuch meaning as they pretend, without making meer Nonſenſe of the words foregoing, which are theſe. *But thou ſayſt, the Church was founded upon* Peter; *tho the very ſame in another place is done upon all the Apoſtles, and they received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the ſtrength of the Church is ſolidly bottom'd upon them* EQUALLY. And then follows the words now named, *Yet* ONE *was therefore choſen among the* XII, *&c.* which makes it as clear as the Sun, that he dreamt of no ſuch HEADSHIP of ONE over all the reſt, as ſignifies a Supremacy of Power: for what one Text, he ſaith, affirms of *Peter*, another affirms of them *all*; they all receiving the

the *Keys* (which is the higheſt Power) and the ſtability of the Church relying upon them *equally*.

I conclude this part of my Diſcourſe with the Obſervation of a late Learned Writer of our Church *. If any Power or degree of Power was here promiſed to *Peter*, more than to the reſt of the Apoſtles, it muſt be gathered either from the force of the *Subſtance* of the Promiſe, or from the *Circumſtances* wherewith it was delivered.

* *Dr.* Hammond's *Diſpatcher diſpatch'd*, P. iii. c. 7. Sect. 2. n. 13.

The *Subſtantial* part is nothing elſe but that of a *Steward* in the Church, ſet forth by the Emblem of *Keys*, and more explicitly declared by the *Power of binding and looſing*; which carries in it no intimation of ſuch a thing as a *Supremacy* over the whole Church, but only of a *ruling Power* in ſome Family; that is, in that part of the Univerſal Church where his lot ſhould fall. For this very thing being preſently after promiſed to all the Apoſtles, it makes it evident, there was no Supremacy here promiſed; for then there muſt be not *one*, but *twelve* Supremes.

As for the *Circumſtances*, wherein *this* part and the *former* of our Saviour's Promiſe was delivered (which ſome are pleaſed to urge as very conſiderable) they are of no ſtrength to ſupport ſo great a weight as they lay upon them. For *firſt*, It is very unreaſonable that *Circumſtances* ſhould be thought of greater force to declare the meaning of this Promiſe, than the very *Subſtance* it ſelf is. And *ſecondly*, All theſe Circumſtances (ſave only that of his own Name and his Fathers joyned together) are not peculiar to him, but common to others, who *confeſſed Chriſt's Divinity*, and had it *revealed from God*, and were *bleſſed*, and deſigned for *Stones* in the Fabrick of the Church, as well as *Peter*. And *further*, even that *Circumſtance* of calling him *Simon Barjona*

jona had a viſible reaſon for it, to diſtinguiſh this *Simon* from *Simon Zelotes*. So that there is nothing left but the *ſmall Circumſtance* of calling him by his Name, to be the grand Foundation of St. *Peter*'s Supremacy.

Can any one be ſatisfied with ſuch poor Proofs? Which are no better than if we ſhould argue in this manner, our Lord ſaid to *Peter*, *Follow me*, and ſo he did to the other eleven, and by this made them his Diſciples in common. But had he ſaid, *Simon Barjona*, *Follow thou me*, (as he might very well, if any other *Simon* were then preſent) he alone (according to this way of diſcourſing) had been taken into Diſcipleſhip, and none after him enjoyed this Honour.

But I have ſaid enough, if not too much, upon theſe *Texts*; and muſt here end this Paper, for fear of ſwelling it beyond the intended bulk. The reſt ſhall ſoon follow.

ERRATA.

PAge 81. line 21. for *will be*, read *were*.
P. 83. l. 31. r. *underſtood*.
P. 85. l. 10. del. *of*, l. *ult.* r. *walk on*.
P. 88. *penult.* r. *falſified*.
P. 93. l. 29. del. *of* before *Peter's*.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiſwel* at the Roſe and Crown in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard, 1688.

The Second Part.

The TEXTS examined which *Papists* cite out of the *Bible*, TO PROVE *The Supremacy of St.* PETER *and of the* POPE *over the whole Church.*

IMPRIMATUR.

Febr. 14. 1687. *Guil. Needham.*

III.

NOw we are come to the laſt reſerve of the Roman Church, for the ſupport of this Cauſe; which lies in thoſe Words of Chriſt to *Peter*, John xxi. 15, 16, 17. *Feed my Lambs*, and *feed my Sheep*. They are ſenſible of the truth of that, which hath been oft repeated, that in neither of the former places Chriſt gave any thing to *Peter*; but only promiſed he would give him ſuch things as

are there mentioned. Now they are hard put to it, to find when he did perform this Promiſe; and not find with all, that he performed it to all the Apoſtles: and therefore, as I have ſaid, made it to them all. Here is the only Place they rely upon; here they would fain find, what is no where elſe to be found, ſomething peculiarly granted to *Peter*, which was conferred upon none of the reſt. Read the words, ſay they, and obſerve how they are peculiarly ſpoken to *Peter*: *So when they had dined, Jeſus ſaid to* Simon Peter, Simon *Son of* Jonas, *loveſt thou theſe me more than theſe? He ſaith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knoweſt I love thee. He ſaith unto him,* FEED MY LAMBS. *He ſaith to him again the ſecond time,* Simon *Son of* Jonas, *loveſt thou me? He ſaith unto him, Yea, Lord, thou knoweſt that I love thee. He ſaith unto him,* FEED MY SHEEP. *He ſaith unto him the third time,* Simon *Son of* Jonas, *loveſt thou me?* Peter *was grieved becauſe he ſaid unto him the third time, Loveſt thou me? And he ſaid unto him, Lord, thou knoweſt all things; thou knoweſt that I love thee. Jeſus ſaith unto him,* FEED MY SHEEP.

See, ſay they, with what Solemnity our Lord here ſpeaks to *Peter*, and to him alone, calling him *three* times particularly by his *Name* and *Relation*, and bidding him as oft, *feed his Lambs* or *Sheep*; whereby he inſtated him in the Office he had promiſed him, and made him, in a particular manner, to be a *Paſtor*, even the Paſtor of the *whole Church*, with a Supreme Power over it.

Firſt; To which we reply, That having ſeen and conſidered all this, we can ſee nothing here that looks like a *Grant* or *Commiſſion*; nothing given to St. *Peter* by

by theſe words; which are a plain *Charge* or *Command*, requiring him to do his Office, which w astherefore conferred upon him before, together with the reſt of the Apoſtles, when our Lord ſaid, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you*, &c. *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt*, &c.

Secondly; And as here is no *Commiſſion*, no *Conveyance* of any thing made to him, but a bare *Precept* to do his *Duty*: So the *Duty* doth not concern him alone, but belongs to them all as much as him. It is at this time required in a Precept directed to him alone, that's true: and *Bellarmine* might have ſpared all his Labour to prove, that theſe words were ſpoken to *Peter* alone. They were ſo, if we underſtand thereby that he only by Name, is now admoniſhed of his Duty; (the reaſon of which we ſhall ſee preſently) but the *Duty* of which he was admoniſhed was not peculiar to him; and ſo the words do not belong to him alone, as appears by many Arguments.

1. From St. *Peter* himſelf, who ſeems to have interpreted the Mind of Chriſt in this Speech to him, in his words to the Elders of the Church to whom he wrote; 1 *Pet.* v. 1. *The Elders, which are among you, I exhort, who am*, What? the Monarch of the Church? the Vicar of Chriſt? Or Paſtor of Paſtors? The Chief Apoſtle? Or Supreme Biſhop? No ſuch thing, but συμπρεσβύτερος, *your fellow Elder*, &c. *Feed the Flock of God which is among you*, &c. And from whom did theſe Elders receive their Power and Authority? From St. *Peter?* No ſuch matter, but from the chief Shepherd or Paſtor, from whom he bids them expect their Reward, *ver.* 4.

2. In like manner St. *Paul* gives the very ſame Charge to the Elders of *Epheſus*, to *take heed to themſelves, and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghoſt had made them Overſeers, to* FEED *the Church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own Blood.* Acts xx. 28.

3. For Chriſt, as I ſaid, had given this Power unto all his Apoſtles, when he ſaid, *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you*, &c. *Joh.* xx. 21. What did he ſend them to do? but to *gather together in one, the Children of God that were ſcattered abroad*, and to *feed* his Flock, as He the *good Shepherd* had done, *Joh.* x. 11. & xi. 52. And therefore we may ſay here of theſe words, as *Rigaltius* doth of the former; He ſaid to *Peter*, Feed my Sheep; but he doth not ſay, do thou *alone* feed them. No; it may be further obſerved, that our Lord in his Life-time, ſent them all to the *loſt Sheep of the Houſe of* Iſrael; *Matth.* x. 6, 7. And, a little before this, ſeeing the People ſcattered abroad *as Sheep having no Shepherd*, he bad his Diſciples pray that the *Lord would ſend Labourers* among them: not one (who ſhould depute others) but as many as were needful to gather in his Harveſt: *Matth.* ix. 36, &c.

4. And therefore thus the ancient Fathers have expounded theſe words; particularly the *Roman Clergy* themſelves in their Letter to the Clergy of *Carthage*, where admoniſhing them of their Duty, (in the abſence of St. *Cyprian* by reaſon of the then Perſecution) they preſs them with theſe words to *Peter*; *Feed my Sheep*; which, they tell them, the *reſt of the Diſciples in like manner did*, and accordingly it was now incumbent upon them alſo *, *in the room of the Paſtor to keep the Flock.*

* Vice Paſtoris cuſtodire gregem.

This

This *Launoy* * proves is the Expoſition of the Church, and moſt juſtly condemns *Bellarmine* (and ſuch like Flatterers) as failing in his Duty: Which required him to expound theſe words according to the Senſe of the whole Church, which is directly againſt this Expoſition, that Chriſt here gave this Power to *Peter* alone. A great many of the ancient *Popes* of *Rome*, he there ſhews, ſpeak otherwiſe; and one of their Neighbours, St. *Ambroſe*, expreſly declares, that *thoſe Sheep, and that Flock* which Chriſt bad *Peter* feed, *he did not alone receive, but he both received them with us, and with him we all received them* †. As much as to ſay, what Chriſt ſaid to *Peter*, he ſpake in him to all Biſhops. Which is the Senſe of St. *Auſtin* in a great many places (the ſame Author ſhows ‖) making *Peter* here alſo to have repreſented the whole Church: ſo that *when it was ſaid to him, it was ſaid to all, Loveſt thou me? Feed my Sheep* *.

* Epiſt. Par. ii. ad Raimundum Formentinum, *p.* 27, &c.

† L. de Sacerd. dignit. c. 2.

‖ Launoy Epiſt. pars v. Carolo Magiſtro.

* De Agone Chriſtiano cap. 30.

5. But what need any further Teſtimonies? when this *Preface* is ſung not only in the Feaſt of St. *Peter*, but of all the reſt of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts (except St. *John*) and on their *Octaves* in the *Roman* Church at this very day; *We humbly beſeech thee, O Lord, the Eternal Paſtor, not to forſake thy Flock, but preſerve it with continued Protection, by thy bleſſed Apoſtles: That it may be governed by the ſame Rulers, which as VICARS of thy Work, thou didſt beſtow upon it, to be ſet PASTORS over it.* This is ſufficient to ſhew that the *Roman* Church it ſelf hath anciently believed, this Charge was given to all the Apoſtles to feed his Flock, and be the *chief Paſtors of it* †.

† Præeſſe Paſtores.

What? will ſome ſay, was there nothing here peculiarly ſpoken to *Peter*? No Myſtery in thoſe words thrice

thrice repeated, and ſpecially directed to him by name, as you cannot but acknowledg? Yes, no doubt; but it is no more than this, that *Peter* of all the reſt, had lately *thrice* denied his Maſter. This might well have made *Peter* himſelf queſtion his Love to Chriſt; and move our Lord to ask him whether he ſtill remained as confident as he was before, that he had a greater Affection to him than any of his Diſciples. For ſo he begins this Speech, *Loveſt thou me more than theſe?* As he had fancied he did, when he ſaid, *tho all Men ſhall be offended becauſe of thee, yet will I never be offended*; Matth. xxvi. 33. The vanity of which thoughts he had found by ſad Experience, he alone denying, nay abjuring his Maſter. In this *Peter* was ſingular, and did more than any of the reſt. For which cauſe more was to be ſaid to him, and more was to be done by him, than any of them. He was to anſwer *thrice* to *three* Queſtions, which were ſolemnly put to him, that by a *threefold* Confeſſion, he might obliterate his *threefold* denial.

This is all the Myſtery which the ancient Chriſtians could find in this ſolemn Speech, made with particular Application to *Peter*, as may be ſeen in St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* *, St. *Auſtin* †, *Greg. Nazianzen* ‖, and a long train, which I could ſet down, of other Fathers; which aſſures us that this was the common and literal Expoſition of theſe words, and that they underſtood no other reaſon why our Lord addreſſed himſelf only to *Peter*, tho other Apoſtles were preſent, but only this; that he might declare he would have *Peter* notwithſtanding his denying him thrice, be confident, upon this profeſſion of Love to him, he was reſtored to his Favour, and that he would have him no leſs than the reſt, look upon the care of his Flock as belonging

* In *John* xxi.
† Tract. xlvii. in Johan.
‖ Tract. xxix.

longing to him, who had deſerved by his ſhamefully repeated denial of him, to fall from that Office, more than any other of his Apoſtles. For tho they all fled, yet none denied him but *Peter* alone; and therefore theſe words were as if our Lord had ſaid, *Tho there be cauſe enough for me to reject thee, yet becauſe thou didſt repent thee of thy Sin, and doſt now profeſs thy Love to me, Feed my Sheep, no leſs than the reſt of my Apoſtles to whom I have committed the care of them*; which will ſufficiently expoſe the vanity of the *Catholick Scripturiſt* *, who bids us (againſt the ſenſe of all Antiquity) to *note that our Lord would not have required greater Love in* Peter *rather than in any of the reſt, nor have ſaid*, Loveſt thou me more than theſe? *if he had not here intended to give him higher dignity in Paſtorſhip than the reſt.* Note rather, good Reader, what hath been ſaid, and theſe words of St. *Cyril*, who was a better *Scripturiſt*, and more *Catholick* than this Jeſuit. I will not ſet them down at large, but only the Concluſion of them, which are very remarkable, and expreſly expound this Paſſage as I have done. *In that Speech of our Lord, FEED MY SHEEP, there was a kind of renewal* † *of the Apoſtleſhip formerly beſtowed upon him; doing away the Infamy his of Falls, and blotting out the cowardiſe of human Infirmity.* Where a great Perſon of our own hath juſtly remarked that word *renewal* ‖: He doth not ſay that our Lord *augmented* his Dignity (which is the new Doctrine) but that he *renewed* it, or *reſtored* him to it. Which Dignity he had ſaid (in the beginning of this Diſcourſe) *Peter* was advanced unto, when our Lord named him, not *præ aliis*, above others, but *cum aliis* *, with other Diſciples, to be an Apoſtle; and therefore now did not give him more than

* Seventh's Point, n. 7.

† ἀνανέωσις, ὥσπερ τις, &c. L. xii. in Joh. p. 1120.

‖ Bp Andrew Tortura Tort. p. 51.

* ἐμοῦ τοις ἑτέροις, Cyril. Ib.

than the reſt, but only declared he did not take the forfeiture he had made of that Dignity, but re-inſtated him in it, together with the reſt.

This is undoubtedly the ancient Senſe of Chriſt's Church; to which I know not what to add for the Explication of theſe words, unleſs it be this, that *Peter* had, juſt before this Diſcourſe of our Lord's, begun to expreſs his earneſt deſire to recover his Favour; caſting himſelf into the Sea (when the other Diſciples came by the Ship) to get to our Saviour; which may be look'd upon as a token of exceſſive Love to him, and of a more than ordinary deſire to enjoy his Company. From hence a very learned Writer * of this Church, thinks our Lord takes occaſion to make this Speech to him (but whether to *check* or to *cheriſh* that deſire he dares not determine) the import of which he gives in this Paraphraſe. *Thou haſt made profeſſion of more than ordinary Love to me, of readineſs to lay down thy Life for my ſake, tho all others, even theſe thy Fellows, ſhould forſake me; and art willing, I ſee, by thy preſent hazard of it, to make good thy former words. But wouldſt thou have me yet to ſhew thee a more excellent way? I have told it thee long ſince; Thou art converted, ſtrengthen thy Bretren.* SIMON *the Son of* JONA, *if thou deſireſt to prove thy ſelf a* CEPHAS, *or teſtify the ſincerity of thy Faith and Love (which by the Powers of darkneſs were of late ſo grievouſly ſhaken)* FEED MY LAMBS, FEED MY SHEEP. *Yea, ſeeing thou thrice denieds't the Shepherd of thy Soul, I ſay unto thee the third time,* FEED MY SHEEP. *Let the Memory of thy fore-paſſed threefold Sin; alſo let this my preſent threefold admonition, excite thee unto triple diligence in thy Charge to ſhew ſuch pity and compaſſion, as I have ſhewed*

* *Dr.* Jackſon *Book* iii. *upon the Creed*, c. 7.

to

if you do but ſo contrive it that *Peter* have all under his Care, and the Apoſtles themſelves be his *Curates*.

But they who can be pleaſed with ſuch Conceits as theſe, have little Reverence for the Holy Scriptures; and it is a great Affront unto our Underſtandings to offer us meer Imaginations for Reaſons; their own Dreams inſtead of the Divine Oracles. If it may conſiſt with Chriſtian Sobriety, to make ſuch a nice diſtinction between *Lambs* and *Sheep*, as to make them imply different things (any more than the two ſeveral words for *feed* †, and for *loveſt thou me*, are thought to do) it is far more likely that our Lord intended to ſignify the Care that ought to be taken of all Chriſtians ſuitable to the diverſity of their States. *Some of which* (as a great Man ‖ of our own Church ſpeaks) *are to be handled tenderly, and cheriſhed like Lambs; others to be look'd unto like elder Sheep, and to be fed with ſtronger Meat, but with leſs perſonal or aſſiduous Attendance.*

† Βόσκε & ποίμαινε. ἀγαπᾷς & φιλεῖς.

‖ Dr. *Jacks.* B. 3. c. vii. Sect. x.

This hath ſome ſenſe in it, which is very uſeful, and agreeable to all Mens Thoughts: but if we ſet our fancies on work, they abound with vain Conceits of which we can find no end. For if *Lambs*, and *Lambkins*, and *Sheep* only be St. *Peter*'s Walk, and he the Shepherd, where are the *Rams*? (as a no leſs learned * than ingenious Man asks) they are excepted it ſeems, and *Rams*, as *Turrianus* fancies, are the *Apoſtles*, or their Succeſſors, that is, *Biſhops*: or, as Cardinal *Tolet* † (*Bellarmin*'s Equal) will have it, they are *Kings* and Princes: and ſo theſe two, *Apoſtles* and *Kings* are by this Interpretation both ſhut out; whom *Bellarmine* intended by his Device to have ſhut into *Peter*'s Fold.

* Dr. *Collin*'s EPPHATA. p. 51.

† In xv. Joh. Annot. 3.

But the graver ſort of Writers even in the *Roman* Church, are aſhamed of ſuch Myſteries as theſe; which they ſee may be invented at pleaſure. *Maldonate* ‖ himſelf (to ſay nothing of *Janſenius*) bids thoſe, who ſubtilly enquire, why Chriſt calls his Diſciples *Lambs*, rather than *Sheep*, think again and again what they do, and take heed leſt they expoſe themſelves to the laughter of the Learned: for the difference is in word, not in ſenſe; ſave only that the word *Lamb* hath ſomething in it more ſoft and tender, and might be uſed to commend them the more to *Peter*'s Affection. For this diminutive form of ſpeech is a ſign of very tender and ardent Love, and more moving than any other; as appears by the common inſtance of a dying Father, who expreſſes more of his own Affection, and works more upon his Friends, if he ſays, I commend to you the Care of *my little Babes*, than if he ſimply ſays, I commend the Care of *my Children* to you: Whence it is our Saviour ſometimes uſed this form, juſt before he parted with his Diſciples, *John* xiii. 33. *Little Children, yet a little while I am with you*, &c. and his Apoſtles alſo, particularly St. *John*, who uſes it *ſeven times* in his firſt Epiſtle, to declare the Greatneſs and Tenderneſs of his Love, and to excite the like in others.

‖ in Joh. xxi. 15, *&c.*

That Writer * indeed purſues no leſs than the other, the pretenſions of the Church of *Rome* from theſe words; though he like not this Curioſity: inſiſting upon Chriſt's committing *all the Sheep*, (i. e. all Chriſtians) to *Peter*. Which will not do their buſineſs, ſince they were no otherwiſe committed to him than they were to the reſt of Chriſt's Apoſtles: who had the ſame Power given them, and were to take the ſame

* *Maldonate.*

ſame Care of all Chriſt's Flock that he did. Not that every one of them was to *feed* or teach *all* Chriſtians, ſimply and univerſally underſtood; for that was impoſſible, and would have made the Labours of the reſt uſeleſs, if one were ſufficient: but *all* indefinitely, ſo that among them none ſhould be neglected, but inſtructed by ſome or other of them. This muſt neceſſarily be the meaning: for otherwiſe, our Lord bad *Peter* do that which could not be done by one Man; or, if it could have been done, would have made all the other Apoſtles idle, and left them nothing to do.

No, ſay they, we do not mean that *Peter* alone was to preach the Goſpel to all Nations; ſo he could not *feed* all; but *this* ſort of *feeding* muſt be allowed to others: but he alone was to rule and govern in chief, to *feed* by Authority and Power over all, whereby he was to preſcribe what was to be taught and believed.

But this is to return where we were before, to the ſignification of the Word *Feed*; which cannot mean one thing with reſpect to *Peter*, and another with reſpect to the reſt: but ſignifies the ſame Power, be it what it will, common to them all. If this need any further Explication, thoſe Words of our Lord, *Go, and teach all Nations*, Matth. xxviii. 19. *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Goſpel unto every Creature*, Mark xvi. 15. will ſatisfy us that *Peter* had no peculiar Authority conferred on him, above the other Apoſtles. For he gave this Charge to them all, and it was uſhered in with a far more magnificent Preface to it, than when he ſpake here particularly to *Peter*; for he firſt acquaints them with his own

Supreme Authority, ſaying, *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth*, and then adds, *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations*, &c. which is a *Commiſſion* as large as could be given to Men; including in it all the Power that was neceſſary for the eſtabliſhing and governing thoſe Churches which they ſhould gather unto Chriſt.

Who can think that they who had this Authority given them, were themſelves to be taught and governed by *Peter* alone? Nothing could put ſuch a Conceit into Mens Minds, but an ambitious deſire to advance themſelves to the higheſt Dominion, by raiſing *Peter* above all others: Who, it is evident, did not take themſelves to be all inferiour to him; nor to be leſs able to *feed* him, than he was to *feed* them. For St. *Paul* (who was herein inferiour that he was called late to be an Apoſtle, as *one born out of due time*) did take upon him to *feed Peter*, and that with his *Staff* too (if I may ſo ſpeak) that is, with his Reproof; and this at *Antioch*, St. *Peter*'s own Seat: Where it had been very proper for him one would think, to have ſtood upon his peculiar Prerogative, if he had known of any belonging to him.

Which if he could have challenged, we ſhould ſtill be to ſeek by what right the Biſhop of *Rome* claims the ſame Authority that St. *Peter* had. O ſays *Boniface* the VIII*th* *, Chriſt ſpake to *Peter* and to his *Succeſſors*, when he ſaid, *FEED MY SHEEP.* But how doth he prove that? Why, we muſt take his bare word for it, both that he ſpake theſe words to *Peter*'s Succeſſors, and to them alone, and that the Biſhops of *Rome* are his ſole Succeſſors: All this he delivers as an infallible *Dictator*, and it is not good man-

* Extravagant. L. 1. Tit. 8. de Major. & Obedientia.

manners to queſtion that the Univerſal Flock of Chriſt is ſo committed to them, that *whether Greeks or others ſhall ſay, they are not committed to* Peter *and his Succeſſors, they muſt neceſſarily confeſs they are none of the* SHEEP *of Chriſt.* But it is worth any bodies while to read on to the end of that *Extravagant* where he aſſerts this: whereby they will be infallibly ſatisfied he was no infallible Interpreter, but a groſs Perverter of the Holy Scriptures. For " here it is that he proves in the Church there is " both the *Spiritual* and the *Temporal* Power, from " thoſe Words, *Behold here are two Swords*, Luk. " xxii. 38. and that the Temporal Power is ſubject " to the Spiritual, becauſe *the Powers that are, are* " *ordained of God* (Rom. xiii. 1.) for they would " not be in *order*, unleſs Sword were under Sword, " and Spiritual things are ſuperiour to Temporal. " For the Prophecy of *Jeremy* is verified of the " Church and the Eccleſiaſtical Power, *ch.* i. 10. *Behold,* " *I have ſet thee this day over the Nations, and over* " *the Kingdoms, to root up, and pull down,* &c. There- " fore the Temporal Power, if it go out of the way, " muſt be judged by the Spiritual; but the Supreme " Spiritual Power, by God alone, not by Man; as the " Apoſtle bears witneſs, 1 *Cor.* ii. 15. *He that is Spiritu-* " *al judgeth all things, but he himſelf is judged of no Man.* After all which goodly *Interpretation* of Holy Scriptures (more like *Paſquill* than the *Pope*) he concludes moſt pontifically, *We declare, affirm, define and pronounce, that it is altogether neceſſary to Salvation, for every humane Creature to be ſubject to the Pope of* Rome.

This is his Concluſion from FEED MY SHEEP, and from other Places of Scripture, expounded after the

the very ſame faſhion as he abuſes this: Which tho it be very preſumptuous, yet is not too arrogant for him who could entertain ſuch a monſtrous Conceit, as this which we read in one of his *Decrees* *. Where he ſays, *Chriſt made* Peter *the Chief, that from him, as from a certain Head, he might diffuſe, as it were, his Gifts into the* whole Body; for that having taken *him* IN CONSORTIUM INDIVIDUÆ TRINITATIS, *into the Partnerſhip of the undivided Trinity: He would have him called that which the Lord himſelf was, ſaying,* THOU ART PETER, *and upon* THIS ROCK *I will build my Church.* Now if *Peter* be thus exalted into the *Conſortſhip of the Bleſſed Trinity*, and the *Pope* have a juſt claim unto all that belongs to *Peter*; then is the Pope no leſs than OUR LORD GOD, as ſome of the Canoniſts have called him; unto whom *Boniface* might well conclude all muſt be ſubject upon pain of Damnation.

* Sexti Decret. L. 1. Tit. vi. cap. xvii. *Fundamenta.*

I conclude this whole Diſcourſe with theſe *three* Obſervations; which are better grounded than their proud *Decrees*.

Firſt, It is worth conſidering, that this lofty Structure which they have erected in the Church of *Rome*, of the Supremacy of their Biſhop, is built barely upon *three* Metaphorical Speeches of our Saviour unto St. *Peter*, without one word or ſyllable concerning the Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other Succeſſor. One would have expected that a thing of this mighty moment ſhould have had a ſtronger Foundation, and been delivered in plainer words, than *upon this Rock*,

I will give thee the Keys, and, *Feed my Sheep:* and that we ſhould have been told alſo in down-right terms, who ſhould inherit the ſupreme Power, ſuppoſed to be conferred by theſe Metaphorical Speeches when he was dead and gone; eſpecially, if all Chriſtians in the World muſt neceſſarily, upon pain of Damnation, be ſubject to *Peter*'s Succeſſor.

And yet ſo it is, this is all, that a Wit of ſuch height as *Bellarmine*'s (who is wont to ſcrape up all that any way ſeems to make for his purpoſe) durſt venture to alledg out of the Holy Scriptures for the proof of ſo weighty a Point.

The *Rhemiſts* indeed in their *Annotations* upon the *New Teſtament*, make bold with *two* places more, which they apply to this buſineſs; but with ſo little Reaſon (not to ſay ſo ridiculouſly) that he had the diſcretion to let them alone.

One is in St. *Matthew* xiv.29. where, upon the word *walked*, they have this wiſe Note. *Peter* (ſaith St. *Bernard*) *walking upon the Waters as Chriſt did, DECLARED himſelf the ONLY VICAR of Chriſt: which ſhould be Ruler not over one People, but over ALL: For many Waters are many People. And from hence he deduceth the like Authority and Juriſdiction, to his Succeſſors the Biſhops of* Rome.

And a goodly *Deduction* it is, for which they are mightily beholden to St. *Bernard*, who could ſpy ſuch a notable *Declaration* of St. *Peter*'s ſole Vicarſhip, and draw from thence ſuch a fine Argument for the *Pope*'s Authority, as no ancient Doctor beſides himſelf was able to find in this place. But muſt his Fancies paſs for ſubſtantial Proofs of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Supremacy, which was raiſed to a great height in his days?

At

At this rate no body need want Proofs for the moſt deteſtable Hereſies, which he ſhall pleaſe to deviſe, if ſuch Conceits as theſe be allowed for Arguments.

And their *ſecond* Annotation is like to this, of which, for ought I know, they may have the honour to be the Inventors, without the help of St. *Bernard*. For becauſe our Saviour, when there were *two* Ships, went in that which was *Simon's* (Luke v. 3.) and thence taught the People, they gravely conclude, that undoubtedly he taught out of *that* Ship and not the other, on purpoſe *to ſignify the Church reſembled by* Peter's *Ship, and that in it is the Chair of Chriſt, and only true preaching.* By which, it is evident, they intended the Reader ſhould underſtand, that as *Peter* was Owner of that Ship, ſo he and his Succeſſors are Rulers of the whole Church. For upon the following Verſes (*ver.* 7, 10.) they obſerve how *Peter* had ſo much work, that he was fain to call for help, and *joyned thoſe who were in the other Ship as Co-partners in the Preaching of the Goſpel.* As much as to ſay, the Work was committed to him alone, who took in ſuch help as he needed. He was the only *Paſtor*, and all the reſt (as was ſaid before) his *Curates*. For, they tell us, *all this aforeſaid did properly mean, his Travels in the Converſion of the World, and his Prerogative therein before all Men; as is evident by Chriſt's ſpecial Promiſe made to him SEVERALLY and APART in this place, that he ſhould be made the TAKER OF MEN.* What then became of all the reſt? Were they to ſit ſtill in their Ship and do nothing? O no, by no means; *He giveth to other* (ſay theſe Annotators) *the like Office as to* Peter's *Co-operators and Co-adjutors.*

Before

Before they ſaid that *Peter* called them and joyned them to himſelf, as *Co-partners in the preaching of the Goſpel*; but now having better, it ſeems, bethought themſelves, they ſay *Chriſt* appointed them to this Office; yet ſtill they are but as *Peter*'s Co-operators, and Aſſiſtants. He was the *Taker of Men*, and converted the World; they only came in to *his* help, and brought all the Fiſh into *his* Net. *Their* Ship ſignified nothing, it was *Peter* alone that ſignified all. Their Ship ſtands for a meer *Cypher*; his Ship is the *Figure* of the whole Church, where he governs, and they are but *helps* in Government, meer *Co-adjutors* unto him, the great, and indeed, only Biſhop over all.

Who can endure ſuch *Annotations* as theſe, in which Men play with the Holy Scriptures as they pleaſe, and play with them in ſo ſaucy a manner, as to interpret them directly againſt the Scriptures. In which the Apoſtles call themſelves *Workers together* with Chriſt (2 *Cor.* vi. 1.) imployed by him to be *his Co-operators*, not St. *Peter*'s; who was ſo far from being the *Converter of the World*, that his *Travels* and Pains were moſt beſtowed in the leaſt part of it. Which *Bellarmine*, I ſuppoſe, ſaw well enough, and therefore was ſo wiſe, as not to mention ſuch Allegories. Which may ſerve to entertain the Fancies of ſilly People, but are the juſt ſcorn of thoſe that have any meaſure of Spiritual Underſtanding: Who have heard perhaps, that the Fathers ſometimes reſembled the Church of Chriſt to *Peter*'s Ship; but not that they ever dream'd of making him, and the Biſhop of *Rome* after him, the Governour of the whole Church, becauſe he was Maſter of that Ship.

There is nothing more unaccountable than ſuch a Concluſion, unleſs it be their pretence to Infallibility, who are meer Triflers when they meddle with the Holy Scriptures; which is the next thing I would have obſerved.

Secondly; If the danger of wreſting the Scriptures be a good reaſon why the common People ſhould not read them, then no body at all ſhould look into them; for their moſt learned Prieſts have wreſted them more than the common People. And that againſt their Oath, whereby they are bound to interpret Scripture *according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers*, who all agree that what was ſaid to *Peter* in theſe three places belonged to all the Apoſtles; whoſe Writings, as the reſt of the Scriptures, have by none been more foully abuſed than by the Popes of *Rome*, whoſe Interpretations and Applications of them, ſhould they be collected in a Book, would make one of the moſt ſhameful pieces that hath been yet extant in the World.

Thirdly; And let the Reader obſerve once more how ill they of that Church are agreed about the Interpretation of theſe *three* places of Scripture, which are the Subject of this Diſcourſe.

There are four Interpretations of the firſt place, *Thou art* Peter, *&c.* (as hath been elſe-where obſerved) which have had great Authors in the *Roman* Church, as well as others. Some by *Rock* underſtand *Peter*'s FAITH in the Confeſſion he had newly made (which by the way, *Joh. Ekius* * ſays in the Age before us, no body denied to be the ſenſe, and bids

* L. 1. contra Luther de Petri Primatu, c. 13.

Luther

Luther name the Man that ſaid otherways) Others CHRIST himſelf, whom *Peter* had confeſſed to be the Son of God; others *PETER*, and others ALL the APOSTLES; which laſt is the Expoſition of *Paſchaſius Radbertus*, the famous Broacher of *Tranſubſtantiation*, whoſe words are theſe: * *The Church of God is built not only upon* Peter, *but upon all the Apoſtles.* Now they who follow the *firſt* and *ſecond* ſenſe, can find no Prerogative here for St. *Peter* above the reſt of the Apoſtles; and they that adhere only to the *third* (in oppoſition to the other, as they now commonly do) are confuted by thoſe who aſſert the *fourth*, that theſe words were ſpoken to *all* the Apoſtles.

* L. iv. in Matthæum.

And indeed they are all forced to confeſs that nothing is here promiſed, which is not contained in the next words, *And I will give thee the Keys*, &c. But what this is, none of them can certainly tell. For one ſort (ſuch as *Cajetan*) hold the *Keys* contain more than *binding* and *looſing*; which *Bellarmine* ſays is falſe; nay a thing never heard of in the Church. And conſequently this Power of *binding and looſing* being promiſed to them all (*Matth.* xviii. 18.) the *Power of the Keys* was promiſed to them all; and Chriſt promiſing nothing but what he performed, he gave therefore the higheſt Power to them all, which is contained in the *Keys*.

Here they are at a great loſs, and cannot agree how to bring themſelves off from this difficulty, which ſtrips *Peter* of his Supremacy. Therefore ſome have deviſed the above-named Conceit, that *Peter* alone had the Keys given him as their *Ordinary*, and they as his *Legats*. But this ſeems too groſs unto others,

who acknowledg they all had the *Keys* immediately from God, as much as *Peter*, if they be conſidered as Apoſtles, but not if they be conſidered as *Biſhops* and *Paſtors*; for theſe *two* Offices they fancy they had, the *Apoſtolical* and the *Paſtoral* Dignity; the firſt *immediately* from Chriſt, the other by and under *Peter*. But this is in a manner, the ſame thing in a little finer dreſs, which was ſaid before. Therefore others unſatisfied with this, that the Apoſtles ſhould receive their Juriſdiction from *Peter*, have ordered the matter on this faſhion, that *Peter* might uſe the *Keys* alone, but *they* not without him.

But *Sixtus Senenſis* cannot digeſt this; and therefore hath deviſed a *threefold* Power in *Peter*, of *Apoſtleſhip*, of *Order*, and of *the Kingdom* *. With reſpect to the *firſt* he grants *Paul* was equal to *Peter*, becauſe he had the Office of Preaching the Goſpel not from *Peter* but from *God*, as much as *Peter* himſelf had. With reſpect to the *ſecond* alſo he acknowledges the truth of what St. *Jerome* writes againſt *Jovinian*, that *all the Apoſtles equally received the Keys* (let the *Catholick Scripturiſt* mind that) *and firmly laid the Foundation of the Church:* and of what he ſays to *Evagrius*; All Biſhops are equal, becauſe all the Apoſtles were ſo. But then with reſpect to the *laſt*, *viz.* the Power of the Kingdom, and Authority over all Biſhops and Churches, *Peter was Head of all.* That is, *Peter* muſt ſome way or other be above all the reſt, but how *they* do not know.

* Biblioth. Sanct. l. v. Annot. clxix.

For Cardinal *Baronius* † will have it that all the Apoſtles had the uſe of the Keys equally with *Peter*, by the *ORDINARY Power of remitting Sins*; and by this diſtinction expounds the fore-named words of St.

† Ad An. 34. n. ccv.

St. *Jerome*. But his Brother, Cardinal *Bellarmine*, (being aware that if *Peter* had the Keys more than the reſt, by an EXTRAORDINARY Power, his Authority would not deſcend upon his Succeſſors) ſays quite contrary, that the Apoſtles had the Power of the Keys after an EXTRAORDINARY manner, and *Peter* only by an ORDINARY *. Thus what one builds up, his Fellow pulls down. There is a Confuſion of Tongues in this *Babel*, which they labour to erect. They cannot agree ſo much as about the *Terms*, wherein they deliver this new Doctrine. For it is a pure Invention, without any Reaſon, or any Authority for it: but it muſt be ſo, though they know not how, becauſe it is their pleaſure.

* L. 1. de Rom. Pont. c. xii.

As all the reſt is, which they draw from the laſt place, *Feed my Sheep*. In which they ſay Chriſt *gave* the Power which he had *promiſed*: and therefore ſince he *promiſed* it to all, he *gave* it to all, if any thing was given here. And yet, againſt ſuch clear demonſtration, they will have this to be a peculiar Grant to *Peter*: no body knows *how* or *why*, but becauſe it ſeems good to them. For this is ſo little approved by others, that they fairly grant the ancient Opinion was (and make it theirs) that theſe Words were not ſpoken to *Peter* in a *Perſonal*, but in a *Publick* Capacity; as he repreſented all the Apoſtles. Inſomuch that they can find nothing *peculiar* to him, in the word FEED, becauſe of that of St. *Auſtin*'s †; *When Chriſt ſaid to* Peter, *he ſaid to all, Feed my Sheep*: nor in the word SHEEP, becauſe St. *Ambroſe* ſaith (in the Place before named)

† De Agone Chriſt. c. 30.

med) *Those Sheep not only* Peter *received; but he received them with us, and we received them with him.* Which things are so evident, that it hath brought some in that Communion to this Conclusion, that out of none of these three Places, nor all of them together, can be gathered so much as the *bare Primacy* of St. *Peter* ‖, after that manner which *Bellarmine* collects it: but it must be gathered thus; that in those places *Peter bears the Person of the Church, speaks for the rest of the Apostles, and is himself spoken unto by Christ in their Name, as the first and principal.*

‖ Du Pin de antiqua Eccles. Discipl. dissert. iv. P. 311.

Behold then the UNITY of which they boast in that Church; and how little CERTAINTY there is among them, even of the main point of their Faith, and as *Bellarmine* * makes bold to call it, *the Sum of Christian Religion.*

* Præfatio in L. de Pontific. Rom.

It stands upon such a tottering Foundation, that, finding how little these Texts in the New Testament avail them, they ransack'd the Old, to fetch some feeble support unto it from thence. And the late *Catholick Scripturist* fancies the Old Testament helps them thus far in this Point, that it teaches †, *That among the Priests of the Old Law, one was chosen successively to be the highest and chief Priest. Commanding all such Causes, as are Ecclesiastical Causes, to be brought to the Tribunal of the High Priest, and his Sentence to be obeyed even under pain of Death.* And for this he alledges *Deut.* xvii. 8.

† *Seventh Point.* n. 1, 3.

But

But this only proves how ignorant ſuch *Catholicks* as he are in the Holy Scriptures. Where it is impoſſible for him to find that the High Prieſts were *choſen ſucceſſively*; for they had that Dignity *by Inheritance*, in one certain Family, and not *by Election*. And as for the Power which he aſcribes to them (though he promiſes us, in his *Preface*, to produce *loud ſpeaking Texts*, for all the Points we miſlike in their Religion) there is not ſo much as a whiſper of it, in the place he alledges. The words of which he did wiſely not to quote, but only the *Chapter* and *Verſe*: Which we, that have liberty to read the Bible, can eaſily diſcern, *ſpeak loudly* againſt him; and confute that Doctrine which he would confirm by them. *If there ariſe*, ſays *Moſes* in that Text, *a Matter too hard for thee in Judgment, between Blood and Blood, between Plea and Plea, and between Stroke and Stroke, being matters of Controverſy within thy Gates: then ſhalt thou ariſe, and get thee up into the place, which the Lord thy God ſhall chooſe. And thou ſhalt come unto the Prieſts the Levites, and unto the Judg that ſhall be in thoſe days and enquire, and they ſhall ſhew thee the ſentence of Judgment. And thou ſhalt do according to the Sentence, which they of that place (which the Lord ſhall chooſe) ſhall ſhew thee*, &c.

I need not recite the reſt at large, to the end of the 12*th* Verſe: For every underſtanding Reader muſt evidently ſee, without going further, that he ſpeaks not a Syllable of the Power of the *High-Prieſt*, but of the Authority of the *Supreme Tribunal*, or *Court* among the *Jews* (which conſiſted of a great number of

of Perſons) wherein all Controverſies, which could not be ended in inferiour Courts, were to be finally determined, without any Appeal.

In which Supreme Court the *High Prieſt* was ſo far from being the *Chief*, that he was not ſo much as admitted to be a Member of it, unleſs he was *a wiſe Man*.

And then, he did not bear an abſolute Sway there, but the Sentence was paſſed by the *whole Council*; as appears (not meerly from the *Jewiſh* Writers, but) from theſe repeated Admonitions in the very Body of this Law. *THEY ſhall ſhew thee* the Sentence of Judgment, *ver.* 9. and thou ſhalt do according to that thing, which THEY of that Place ſhew thee: and obſerve to do according to all that THEY inform thee (*ver.* 10.) according to the Sentence of the Law which THEY ſhall teach thee; according to the Judgment which THEY ſhall tell thee: thou ſhalt not decline from the Sentence which THEY ſhall ſhew thee (*ver.* 11.) Where he muſt be blind who doth not ſee *ſix* flat Contradictions to the Aſſertion of this *Catholick Scripturiſt*, in this very place which he produces, to prove that *Moſes* here ſets up the *Tribunal of the High Prieſt*, and orders his *Sentence* to be obeyed upon pain of Death, in *Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical*.

This was neither *his* Court, nor were Cauſes judged by *his* Sentence, nor is there one word here of *Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical*: but only of *Civil*; between *Blood and Blood, Plea and Plea, Stroke and Stroke*: unleſs we ſuppoſe the Word we tranſlate *Stroke*, relates to the *Plague* of the Leproſy, which belonged to the Prieſts to judg

of

of it: but excluded Men from all *Civil* as well as *Sacred Society.*

And if the utmoſt be granted that can be ſuppoſed [that there is mention here of ſomething appertaining to *Spiritual* Cauſes] yet it muſt be alſo allowed by all Men of ſenſe, that this Text ſpeaks moſt of *Civil* Cauſes: and therefore can no more prove an abſolute Obedience to be due to *Spiritual* than to *Civil* Governours.

All which conſidered, I do not ſee but Dr. *Reynolds* had reaſon to ſay, they might as well call in the help of the firſt words of *Geneſis* [*In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*] as this Verſe in *Deuteronomy*, to ſupport the *Popes* Supremacy. For there, as Pope *Boniface* VIII. very gravely obſerves (in the fore-mentioned *Extravagant*) *Moſes* ſays, God created the Heavens and the Earth, in the *beginning*, not in the *beginnings*; and therefore he who reſiſts the *Popes* Authority, reſiſts the Ordinance of God; unleſs (with *Manichæus*) he feign two *beginnings* (or Principles) which is falſe and heretical.

And by ſuch fine fetches as this *Innocent* III * proved his Power over the whole Church from theſe words in *Deuteronomy*: But he did not mince the matter (as this *Catholick Scripturiſt* doth) but ſtoutly affirmed that the Pope may exerciſe *Temporal* Juriſdiction, as well as *Spiritual*, not only in the *Churches Patrimony*, but in *other Countries* alſo, in certain Cauſes. For "*Deuteronomy* being by Interpretation a *Second Law*, "it proves by the very force of the word, that what

* Decret. Greg. L. iv. Tit. 17. c. 13. per venerabilem.

" is here decreed (in *Deut.* xvii. 8.) ought to be ob-
" ſerved in the New Teſtament. And then the *place*
" *which the Lord hath choſen*, is the *Apoſtolick See*, viz.
" *Rome*; the *Levitical Prieſts*, are *his Brethren* the
" Cardinals; the *High-Prieſt* or Judg, is the *Pope*, the
" *Vicar* of him who is a Prieſt for ever after the Order
" of *Melchiſedec*, appointed by God the Judg of Quick
" and Dead: the firſt ſort of Judgments *between*
" *Blood and Blood*, is meant of *Criminal* and *Civil*
" Cauſes; the laſt, *between Stroke and Stroke*, is meant
" of *Eccleſiaſtical and Criminal*; the middle, *between*
" *Plea and Plea*, belongeth to both *Eccleſiaſtical* and
" *Civil*; in which if any one contemn the Sentence of
" the *Apoſtolick See*, he is doomed *to die*; that is, *to*
" *be ſeparated by the Sentence of Excommunication as a*
" *dead Man, from the Communion of the Faithful.*

Nothing is more evident than that, according to this Catholick Expoſition of *Pope Innocent*, the Biſhop of *Rome* is, by the Divine Law, Head of all Chriſtians, as well in *Civil* Cauſes as in *Eccleſiaſtical*. This Text in *Deuteronomy* proves the one as much as the other: that is, it proves juſt nothing, but that *the Myſtery of Iniquity* wrought very high, when ſuch myſtical Senſes of Holy Scripture were ſwallowed glibly, to confirm the chiefeſt Myſtery of the *Romiſh* Faith.

Perhaps the *Catholick Scripturiſt* will ſay, that they now argue from this place only by a *parity of Reaſon*; that there muſt be but one *High Prieſt* among Chriſtians, becauſe their was no more among the Jews: To which they may have an Anſwer, when they prove that *Judæa* was as big as the whole Chriſtian World.

That's

That's as hopeful a Task for him to labour in, as any he hath undertaken. And ſo I take my leave of him till he hath finiſhed it; for it will be too tedious to follow him to his next Text out of the New Teſtament, *Matth.* xxiii. 2. which he calls an *unanſwerable* Text concerning the *High Prieſts* of the old Law. *Upon the Chair of* Moſes *have ſitten the Scribes and Phariſees; all therefore whatſoever they ſhall ſay unto you, obſerve and do it.* For no body but himſelf can ſee a Syllable here concerning the *High Prieſts*, who did not ſit in *Moſes* his Chair, but were the Succeſſors of *Aaron.* And beſides that, this place belongs to another Head of their Doctrine, about the Popes *Infallibility*; of which if this be a proof, it likewiſe proves the Infallibility of *Annas* and *Caiphas*, and juſtifies thoſe that crucified our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour.

THE END.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiſwel* at the Roſe and Crown in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1688.

ERRATA.

PAge 110. Marg. line 4. for *Tract*, read *Orat.* xxix.
P. 111. l. 2. r. *of his Falls.*
Ib. Marg. *penult.* r. τοῖς.
P. 134. l. 20. r. *ranſack.*